

**KEN Application IT Subcommittee  
Data Transfer work group  
Meeting notes**

Friday, July 13, 2007 – 2:20 to 3:30 p.m.  
Capital Plaza Tower, 1<sup>st</sup> floor Conference Room

**Attending:** Teresa Ogden – COT, Stuart Johnston – CPE, Scott Smith and Jeff Kimmel – EPSB, Rick Chlopan – KCTCS, Lee Muncy, Rob Grissom, and Martin Herbener - KDE.

**Not Attending:** Liz Stafford

Additional information has developed since our meeting. This information will be notated with a **NOTE:**

Meeting started 2:35 pm

Introductions were made. Review of the Charge and Scope for this workgroup were read.

Lee Muncy gave out the following material:

- Enterprise Standards 3000 Network Domain and Category 3650 Content Deliver Network,
- Enterprise Standards and Approved Products – Draft Changes – June 1, 2006,
- Kentucky Enterprise Data Architecture Strategic Vision – version 1.0
- KEN Applications Subcommittee – Work Group on Data Transfer Charge and Scope Document

**Discussion:**

Lee Muncy stated that from what he has read is that this workgroup will probably has the easiest charge of the six workgroups to complete their charge. There seems to be no new direct application or software that will help fulfill the charge. This group deals with those mechanisms already in place that are already seen as “industry best practice” requirements/standards that “move” data among the KEN partners. It will be this workgroup’s purpose to make sure that the partners of the KEN network know the requirements for secure and reliable data transfer that will affect teaching and learning within the Commonwealth. It will also examine possible options the KEN partners’ may have to address and be part of any evolution of the requirements that may affect those common standards in the future within the commonwealth.

Those organizations represented then gave a brief overview of their current data transfer needs and modes of transport. They also gave examples of size and types of data transfer and how they may grow in the future. Many of these examples overlap in terms of scope, type, and size of data. This data is moved from among the KEN partners, partners/vendors, and outside the network (non-KEN organizations within the state, Federal Government entities, associated organizations, and other groups).

The groups use HTTP, FTP over HTTP, FTP over TCP, HTTPS as methods/platforms/modes of transport. They use IPSec, SSL, SSH, and other security method/modes that act on various layers on the 5 layers of the IP model for making sure the data is secure. They as a group meet current standards that are considered to be industry standard.

The group discussed how much of the current data transport usage is aggregate and transactional data/information rather than specific data. However, as organizations start to share data for various purposes such as data warehouses and moving specific data across different aspects of the KEN network (K-12 to Higher Education and/or Workforce) all understand there will

be a greater need to make sure that no identification tags are on the original data as they “drill” down to specific data that will be associated with such sharing of data.

The group discussed how many of the workgroups goals and mechanisms will overlap in many of the applications to be discussed. This could help when the KEN Committee makes requests for future applications needed on the KEN network.

Rob Grissom and Martin Herbener gave an overview of KDE’s data transfer uses, modes of transport, and size of files. They both wanted to make sure that the group keeps in mind the following as they formulate any common standards or recommendations:

1. Data needs to be encrypted both on the sending and receiving end.
2. The transport “pipe” or mode of transport needs to be secure.
3. A mechanism needs to be in place so you can have a “Trusted” relationship with those you send data to.
4. Federal regulations mandate that organizations protect student’s data as well as any health data – this may mandate the need to “scrub” individual identification information especially any types of “open” information.

The discussion then turned toward how the KEN partners can be included in state level discussions regarding how current standards will evolve as part of their charge.

#### **Action Items for the next meeting:**

Teresa Ogden stated she will try to find current COT standards documents, state level groups that deal with data standards, and names of contacts within COT that may be assistance in our workgroup task.

**NOTE:** From an email from Teresa Ogden on Monday, July 16, 2007:

“The first link is Enterprise Standards. Each standard has a policy behind it. I know one of the gentlemen in the meeting was concerned about policy. And, from my viewpoint, the policy is already written. This information is more current than the document you had at the meeting. Here is that link:

[http://technology.ky.gov/epmo/enterprise\\_policies.htm](http://technology.ky.gov/epmo/enterprise_policies.htm)

The second link is to the Enterprise Architecture page. It contains the links to lists of approved hardware, software, protocols, etc. I think this is more what you were looking for and it appears to cover everything discussed in our meeting and more. Here is that link:

[http://technology.ky.gov/policies/architecture\\_and\\_stds.htm](http://technology.ky.gov/policies/architecture_and_stds.htm)

I will have a contact for you about working with the Enterprise Standards team shortly.

**Next Meeting:** TBD - but we will plan on meeting within the next month to review any data we have gathered in the interim.

**Meeting closed at 3:32 pm.**